

REMARKS

This request for continued examination is being filed in order to have the Amendment After Final Rejection dated May 12, 2011 entered into the prosecution record of the present application and to more particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regard as the invention in order to expedite the prosecution of the present application. Specifically speaking, Claims 19 and 41-49 have been canceled. Claim 31 has been amended in order to limit Component (A) to being selected from the group consisting of polyamide 6 resin, polyamide 66 resin and polyamide 6/66 resin. Component (B) has been limited to an α -olefin sulfonate. No new matter has been added. It is respectfully submitted that the currently claimed invention clearly is patentably distinguishable over the prior art cited by the Examiner.

As explained previously, the instant invention provides a plated resin molded article having a high adhesive strength between a thermoplastic resin molded article and a metal plating layer and produces a plated resin molded article having a beautiful aesthetic appearance. The process of the present invention avoids heavy metal-containing acids or potassium permanganate and thereby avoids the environmental hazards which are associated with conventional methods. Moreover, the components of the present invention act together in a synergistic manner to provide a thermoplastic resin molded article having an improved adherence strength to the metal plating layer. It is respectfully submitted that the presently claimed invention is patentably distinguishable over the prior art cited by the Examiner.

The Sano et al reference is directed to a plated polyamide resin article which is obtained by plating, with a suitable plating substance, a molded article of a polyamide resin composition from 30 to 80% by weight of a polyamide resin, from 20 to 70% by weight of a polyphenylene ether

resin, from 1 to 50 parts by weight, per 100 parts by weight of the sum of the polyamide and polyphenylene ether resins, of an impact modifier and from 0.01 to 30 parts by weight, per 100 parts by weight of the sum of the polyamide and polyphenylene ether resins, of a compatibilizer, in which the polyamide resin forms a continuous phase and the polyphenylene ether resin forms a dispersed phase, with a polyamide resin having a crystallinity of from 20-55% with a crystalline region thereof being not less than 72% in the γ crystal form. The Examiner further states that this reference does not teach that the polyamide composition may further comprise pentaerythritol. Applicants further submit that this reference just contains a generic disclosure and does not disclose any specific compositions which fall within the scope of the present claims and, as such, showings of unobviousness of the present invention over resin compositions that fall within the scope of Sano et al but outside of the scope of the present claims are sufficient to establish the patentability of the presently claimed invention over this reference in combination with any other reference.

The Morimoto reference has been cited by the Examiner as teaching that 0.05-5 wt.% of dipentaerythritol can be added to a polyamide composition in order to give good fluidity and mechanical strength properties to the composition. It is assumed that the Jeong et al reference has been cited to teach the addition of phosphorus compounds to a polyamide resin composition as a flame retardant. Assuming that the references teach what the Examiner has suggested they teach, at best the Examiner has made a showing of prima facie obviousness under 35 USC 103(a) which can be rebutted by showings of unexpectedly improved properties of the presently claimed composition commensurate in scope with the claims. It is respectfully submitted that such showings are of record in the present application.

The presently claimed invention is now limited to the composition specifically supported by Example 9 in the present

specification. As shown in Table 1 in the present specification, the composition of Example 9 had an adhesive strength of 140 kPa. In contrast thereto, in a previously filed Declaration Under 37 CFR 1.132, Comparative Example A prepared a resin molded article which used maleic acid as disclosed in Sano et al instead of dipentaerythritol. This composition resulted in an adhesive strength of 85 kPa. An adhesive strength of almost twice as great as that of the prior art is clearly unexpected and establishes the patentability of the presently claimed invention thereover.

The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider the present application and to pass it to issue.

Respectfully submitted,


Terryence F. Chapman

TFC/smd

FLYNN, THIEL, BOUTELL
& TANIS, P.C.
2026 Rambling Road
Kalamazoo, MI 49008-1631
Phone: (269) 381-1156
Fax: (269) 381-5465

Terryence F. Chapman	Reg. No. 32	549
Liane L. Churney	Reg. No. 40	694
Brian R. Tumm	Reg. No. 36	328
Heon Jekal	Reg. No. 64	219
Eugene J. Rath III	Reg. No. 42	094
Marcus P. Dolce	Reg. No. 46	073
Dale H. Thiel	Reg. No. 24	323
David G. Boutell	Reg. No. 25	072
Sidney B. Williams, Jr.	Reg. No. 24	949

Encl: None

136.07/05